arXiv:1203.4004v2 [math.PR] 4 Apr 2012

Large Deviations for an Escaping Measure

A. Mogulskii[1] E. Pechersky [2] A. Yambartsev [3]

[1] Sobolev Institute of Mathematics of of Siberian Branch of Russian Academy of Sciences,
4, ac. Koptyug str., Novosibirsk, Russia,
E-mail: mogul@math.nsc.ru
[2] Dobrushin laboratory of Institute for Information Transmission Problems of Russian Academy of Sciences,
19, Bolshoj Karetny, Moscow, Russia.
E-mail: pech@iitp.ru
[3] Department of Statistics, Institute of Mathematics and Statistics, University of São Paulo, Rua do Matão 1010,
CEP 05508–090, São Paulo SP, Brazil.
E-mail: yambar@ime.usp.br

Abstract

In this paper, the large deviations on trajectory level is studied for a Markov ergodic process ξ. The process ξ is defined on $\mathbb{R}_+$ with values in $\mathbb{Z}_+^2$. A typical path of ξ is a sequence of of excursions in the positive part of $\mathbb{Z}_+^2$ between visits of boundary $\partial\mathbb{Z}_+^2 = \{(z_1, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2\} \cup \{(0, z_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2\}$. The scaled processes $\xi_T(\cdot) = \frac{\xi(\cdot T)}{T}$ converge to zero as $T \to \infty$.

A type of the large deviation principle with rate function

$$I(\underline{f}) = \int_0^1 \big(c_1 f_1(t) + c_2 f_2(t) + c_3 \min\{f_1(t), f_2(t)\}\big) dt$$

is proved. Here $\underline{f} = (f_1, f_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ is a continuous function, and constants c_1, c_2, c_3 are parameters of the process ξ. The local large deviation principle is

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \lim_{n} \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T^2} \ln \mathbf{P}\big(\xi_T \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})\big) = -I(\underline{f}),$$

where $U_{n,\varepsilon}$ is a neighborhood of $\underline{f}$. The large deviation principle is proved as well, however in a restricted form.

1 Introduction

The study of rare event probabilities is an area of modern probability theory which is called a *large deviation theory* (see, for example, the books [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]). Here a scaling method with a scaling parameter tending to infinity (or zero) is applied and the result is asymptotic of probabilities. In most cases asymptotic of logarithm of rare event probabilities is studied (*the logarithmic asymptotic*). A remarkable feature of the theory is that under some rather wide assumptions there exists a function which allows to determine the logarithmic asymptotic. This function is called a *rate function.*

For example, rare events defined by random empirical measures $\mu_{\underline{x}} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_{x_i}$ are studied for ergodic Markov processes $\xi(t)$, where $\underline{x} = (x_1, ..., x_n)$ is a path of the process $\xi(t)$. In this example, the parameter is number n of observations which tends to infinity.

We can mention also a large deviation settings where the logarithmic asymptotic of probabilities appears as a result of decay of randomness. The Freidlin-Ventsel theory for stochastic equations belongs to this kind of large deviations.

A popular systems for the large deviation studies is the sum of independent random variables subjected by the law of large numbers. There is no ergodicity in these cases. Therefore for reasonable settings of large deviations a contraction of random variable space is applied.

All mentioned settings and many others are summarized in a *large deviation principle* (see [6] and all mentioned books). The large deviation principle requires existence of a sequence of measures P_n defined on a "good" topological space X and the measures P_n weakly converge to a delta-measute, $P_n \longrightarrow \delta_{x_0}$, where $x_0 \in X$. The large deviation principle allows to find bounds for asymptotic behavior of sequences

$$\frac{1}{n}\ln P_n(A)$$

of any measurable set $A \subset X$.

In this paper we consider a setting that is usually applied for the sum of independent random variables, that means that a scaling is used, however we study a Markov ergodic processes.

In the next part of this introduction we give a sketch of the studied model and the results.

Basic random object is a Markov ergodic process ξ, its values belong to $\mathbb{Z}_+^2$, the time $\mathbb{R}_+$. That means that paths of ξ are piece-wise constants. The jumps belong to a set

$$\mathcal{Y} = \{(1,0), (0,1), (-1,0), (0,-1), (-1,-1)\}$$

and are such that they do not take the process outside of $\mathbb{Z}_+^2$. Intensities of the jumps depend on the value of ξ at a moment before the jump. If at a moment t the process value is equal to $\xi(t) = (z_1, z_2)$ any enlargement of the values (z_1, z_2) happens with a constant intensity. However, any reduction of (z_1, z_2) happens with an intensity proportional to these co-ordinates. This property implies the ergodicity of the process ξ. A typical path of the process is a sequence of *excursions* in the positive area of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ between returns to $(0,0)$.

We consider large deviations for the sequence $\xi_T(t) = \left(\frac{\xi(tT)}{T}\right)_{T>0}$ of the processes on $t \in [0,1]$ with $\xi(0) = (0,0)$. The distributions of ξ_T converge to δ-measure concentrated at the path $x(t) \equiv (0,0),\ t \in [0,1]$. We study the large deviation principle on a space F of functions on $[0,1]$ such that any $\underline{f} \in F$ has positive co-ordinates except of its value at $t = 0$, where $\underline{f}(0) = (0,0)$. That is, we study asymptotic of large excursion probabilities. The measures P_T induced by $\xi_T(\cdot)$ on F is such that $P_T(F) < 1$.

We prove the large deviation principle for F endowed with a topology such that any function $\underline{f} \in F$ is "infinitely" far from $F_\infty = \{\underline{x}(\cdot) = (x_1(\cdot), x_2(\cdot)) : \inf_{t\in[0,1]} x_1(t)x_2(t) = 0\}$. The rate function is finite for the continuous functions $\underline{f} = (f_1, f_2) \in F$ and equal to the integral over $[0,1]$ of a linear combination of $f_1(t)$ and $f_2(t)$.

This study was inspired by the work [7], where ergodic properties of a more complicate process were studied. The goal of the authors of [7] was the description of a market dynamics. Our goal is focused on some peculiarities of the large deviations for the similar models, and our version of the model is hardly proper for studies of markets.

2 The results

2.1 Notations

Let $\xi(t) = (\xi_1(t),\ \xi_2(t)),\ t \in [0, \infty)$, be a Markov process with the state space $\mathbb{Z}^2_+ := \{(z_1, z_2) :\ z_1 \geq 0,\ z_2 \geq 0\}$. The evolution of the process can be described in the following way. Let a state of the process at a moment $t \geq 0$ be $\xi(t) = \underline{z} = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2_+$. The state is not changed during time $\tau_{\underline{z}}$, where $\tau_{\underline{z}}$ is a random variable distributed exponentially with parameter $h(\underline{z})$. At the moment $t + \tau_{\underline{z}}$ the value of the process becomes equal to $\underline{z} + \underline{y}$, where $\underline{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_{\underline{z}}$ and

$$\mathcal{Y}_{\underline{z}} = \begin{cases} \{(1,0),(0,1),(-1,0),(0,-1),(-1,-1)\} & \text{if } z_1 > 0, z_2 > 0 \\ \{(1,0),(0,1),(-1,0)\} & \text{if } z_1 > 0, z_2 = 0 \\ \{(1,0),(0,1),(0,-1)\} & \text{if } z_1 = 0, z_2 > 0 \\ \{(1,0),(0,1)\} & \text{if } z_1 = 0, z_2 = 0. \end{cases}$$

The intensity of the jumps is a sum

$$h(\underline{z}) := \lambda_{\underline{z}}(1,0) + \lambda_{\underline{z}}(0,1) + \lambda_{\underline{z}}(-1,0) + \lambda_{\underline{z}}(0,-1) + \lambda_{\underline{z}}(-1,-1), \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda_{\underline{z}}(1,0) := \lambda(1,0), \quad \lambda_{\underline{z}}(0,1) := \lambda(0,1), \\ &\lambda_{\underline{z}}(-1,0) := z_1\lambda(-1,0), \quad \lambda_{\underline{z}}(0,-1) := z_2\lambda(0,-1), \\ &\lambda_{\underline{z}}(-1,-1) := \min\{z_1, z_2\}\lambda(-1,-1), \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

constants $\lambda(y)$ at $y \in Y_{\underline{z}}$ are positive. The probability of jump $\underline{y}$ is

$$p_{\underline{z}}(\underline{y}) := \frac{\lambda_{\underline{z}}(\underline{y})}{h(\underline{z})}, \quad \underline{y} = (y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{Y}_{\underline{z}}.$$

2.2 The local large deviation principle.

In this section the *local large deviation principle* is proved. We recall this notion (see [8]).

Let X be a topological space and let $(P_T),\ T > 0$, be a sequence of probability measures on Borel σ-algebra in X converging to a δ-measure δ_{x_0} for some $x_0 \in X$,

$$P_T \Rightarrow \delta_{x_0}. \tag{2.3}$$

The space X should be "good". For example, it may be a Polish space. Details can be found in [8].

The local large deviation principle (*lldp*) means that there exist a rate function

$$I:\ X \to [0, \infty] \tag{2.4}$$

and sequence of increasing reals $r(T)$ such that for any $x \in X$ the equality

$$\lim_{U(x)\downarrow x} \lim_{T} \frac{1}{r(T)} \ln P_T(U(x)) = -I(x), \tag{2.5}$$

holds, where $U(x)$ is a neighborhood of x and $U(x) \downarrow x$ means that $\bigcap U(x) = \{x\}$.

The local large deviation principle implies the weak large deviation principle (a definition of the last can be found, for example in [2]). It seems, the local large deviation principle cannot be deduced from the weak large deviation principle.

In this section we study the local deviation principle for measures (P_T) which are distributions of the processes $(\xi_T(t) = \frac{1}{T}\xi(tT)),\ t \in [0, 1]$, considered on a space F of càdlàg functions $F \ni \underline{f} : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^2_+$. and satisfying the following properties.

$F1$ $\underline{f}(0) = (0, 0)$,

$F2$ $f_1(t) > 0$ and $f_2(t) > 0$ for any $t > 0$, where $\underline{f}(t) = (f_1(t), f_2(t))$.

(A definition of the càdlàg functions or a space of functions D see, for example, in [9]).

A metric in F is introduced with using a series of maps

$$\mu_n:\ F \to F, \quad \mu_n(\underline{f}) = \left(\frac{f_1}{\min\limits_{t\in\left[\frac{1}{n},1\right]} \{f_1(t)\}}, \frac{f_2}{\min\limits_{t\in\left[\frac{1}{n},1\right]} \{f_2(t)\}} \right) =: (f_1^n, f_2^n) =: \underline{f}^n. \tag{2.6}$$

Values

$$d_n(\underline{f}_1, \underline{f}_2) = \sup_{t\in\left[\frac{1}{n},1\right]} \{\|\underline{f}_1^n(t) - \underline{f}_2^n(t)\|\} \tag{2.7}$$

are a semimetrics on F. The notation $\|\cdot\|$ means a norm in $\mathbb{R}^2$. The sequence $d_n(\underline{f}_1, \underline{f}_2)$ may growth very fast as n tends to ∞, that depends on how fast functions $\underline{f}_1$ and $\underline{f}_2$ tends to 0 near 0. However, the sequence

$$q_n(\underline{f}_1, \underline{f}_2) = \arctan(d_n(\underline{f}_1, \underline{f}_2)) \tag{2.8}$$

is bounded and is the sequence of semimetrics, as well. The space F is a metric space with the metric

$$d(\underline{f}_1, \underline{f}_2) = \sum_n \frac{1}{2^n} q_n(\underline{f}_1, \underline{f}_2) \tag{2.9}$$

Further along of open balls

$$U_\varepsilon(\underline{f}) = \{\underline{g}:\ d(\underline{g}, \underline{f}) < \varepsilon\}$$

open sets

$$U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f}) = \{\underline{g}:\ q_n(\underline{g}, \underline{f}) < \varepsilon\}$$

are considered, as well.

The measures (P_T) are pushed out of the space F as $T \to \infty$, that is $P_T(F) \to 0$. Moreover $P_T(F) < 1$. Thereby we have a setting which is not corresponding to this of the local large deviation principle.

We introduce a *local large deviation principle for escaping measures.* This means that (2.5) can be checked on a space, where only a part of measures are concentrated. Further we use shortening *e-lldp* for this kind of the local large deviation principle.

For the case studied in this paper the local large deviation principle for the escaping measures (P_T) looks as the following. Let $\overline{F}$ be a set of càdlàg functions satisfying the conditions $F1$ and

$\overline{F}2$ $f_1(t) \geq 0$ and $f_2(t) \geq 0$ for any $t > 0$, where $\underline{f}(t) = (f_1(t), f_2(t))$.

The functions from $\overline{F} \setminus F$ are "infinitely" far from F. They can be compared with the absolute of hyperbolic spaces. The processes ξ_T converge to an element in $\overline{F} \setminus F$.

Unconditioned e-lldp.

Here we formulate the theorem which claims e-lldp in the space F. For the brevity we shall use the notations $c_0 = \lambda(1,0) + \lambda(0,1)$, $c_1 = \lambda(-1,0)$, $c_2 = \lambda(0,-1)$, $c_3 = \lambda(-1,-1)$ thus

$$h(z_1, z_2) = c_0 + c_1 z_1 + c_2 z_2 + c_3 \min\{z_1, z_2\}.$$

Let

$$I(\underline{f}) = \int_0^1 \big(c_1 f_1(t) + c_2 f_2(t) + c_3 \min\{f_1(t), f_2(t)\}\big) dt. \tag{2.10}$$

The function $I(\underline{f})$ is finite for all function of F, however, in the next theorem e-lldp is proved for continuous functions of F only. Let $F_c \subset F$ be the subset of the continuous functions.

Theorem 2.1. *For any* $\underline{f} \in F_c$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \lim_{n} \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T^2} \ln \mathbf{P}\big(\xi_T \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})\big) = -I(\underline{f}). \tag{2.11}$$

The rate function $I(\underline{f})$ is an integral of a linear combination of f_1, f_2 and $\min\{f_1, f_2\}$ ((2.10)). Such form of the rate function seems paradoxical. Indeed, let function g_1 has a form of a high narrow peak such that $\int_0^1 g_1(t)\mathrm{d}t = \varepsilon_0$ is small, and let $\underline{g} = (g_1, 0)$. The difference of the rate functions $I(\underline{f} + \underline{g})$ and $I(\underline{f})$ is small and equal to ε_0, however $\sup\{g_1(t) - f_1(t)\}$ can be very large.

The explication of this paradox is the difference of rates of the probability decreasing between long time ejections out of 0 and high but short ejections. The probability of the process ξ_T to belong to a neighborhood of $\underline{f}$ has an order

$$e^{-T^2 I(\underline{f})}.$$

It follows from the stated theorem. However, the probability of the process ξ_T to belong to a "neighborhood" of $\underline{g}$ has an order

$$e^{-T \ln(T) C}, \tag{2.12}$$

where C is a constant dependent on $\underline{g}$. The asymptotic (2.12) is not proved in this paper. The word "neighborhood" is in quotas because (2.12) has to be proved in different settings (it will be done in another paper).

It shows that the probability of ξ_T to be out of zero a long time is much less than the probability of high ejection during a short period.

Proof. (i) Upper bound. We show that

$$L_+ := \limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} \limsup_{n} \limsup_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T^2} \ln \mathbf{P}\big(\xi_T \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})\big) \le -I(\underline{f}). \tag{2.13}$$

To this end consider a Markov process $\zeta(t) = (\zeta_1(t), \zeta_2(t)),\ t \ge 0$ with the state space $\mathbb{Z}_+^2$ intensities of jumps equal to 1. The process $\zeta(t)$ is homogenous in the time. At a jump moment the process ζ with probabilities

$$p_{\underline{x}}(\underline{y}) := \frac{\lambda_{\underline{x}}(\underline{y})}{h(\underline{x})}, \quad \underline{y} = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathcal{Y}_{\underline{x}} := \{(1,0), (0,1), (-1,0), (0,-1), (-1,-1)\} \tag{2.14}$$

changes its value from $\underline{x}$ to $\underline{x}+\underline{y}$ (see (2.1), (2.2)). Both processes ξ and ζ have the same distribution of the jumps. The distribution of the process ξ is absolutely continuous with the respect of ζ with density

$$\mathcal{P}(\underline{x}) := \prod_{i=0}^{N(T)} h(\underline{x}(t_i)) e^{-(h(\underline{x}(t_i))-1)\tau_{i+1}},$$

where

$$h(\underline{x}(t)) := c_0 + c_1 x_1(t) + c_2 x_2(t) + c_3 \min\{x_1(t), x_2(t)\}, \tag{2.15}$$

the points $0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_{N(T)} < T$ are jump points of the path $x(t)$ on $[0,T]$, $t_0 = 0,\ t_{N(T)+1} = T$, $N(T)$ is number of the jumps, and $\tau_i := t_{i+1} - t_i$ for $i = 0, 1, \cdots, N(T)$. In other words

$$\mathbf{P}(\xi(\cdot) \in V) = \mathbf{E}(e^{-A_T(\zeta)+B_T(\zeta)+T};\ \zeta(\cdot) \in V) \tag{2.16}$$

for any measurable $V \subset X_T$, where

$$A_T(\underline{x}) := \sum_{i=0}^{N(T)} h(\underline{x}(t_i))\tau_{i+1} = \int_0^T h(\underline{x}(t))dt, \quad B_T(\underline{x}) := \sum_{i=0}^{N(T)} \ln(h(\underline{x}(t_i)))$$

and X_T is a set of all paths on $[0,T]$.

We study an asymptotic of the probability $\mathbf{P}\big(\xi(\cdot) \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})\big)$ using (2.16). The main contribution in this asymptotic comes from A_T. Proving this we consider the scaled processes $\zeta_T(u) = \frac{\zeta(uT)}{T}$. Distributions of ζ_T are concentrated in $\overline{F}$. Let $\underline{f}(u) = \frac{\underline{x}(uT)}{T}$ for $\underline{x} \in X_T$ then

$$\begin{aligned} A_T := A_T(\underline{x}) &= T^2 \int_0^1 \left[\frac{c_0}{T} + c_1 \frac{x_1(uT)}{T} + c_2 \frac{x_2(uT)}{T} + c_3 \min\Big\{\frac{x_1(uT)}{T}, \frac{x_2(uT)}{T}\Big\}\right] du \\ &= T^2 \int_0^1 \left[\frac{c_0}{T} + c_1 f_1(u) + c_2 f_2(u) + c_3 \min\{f_1(u), f_2(u)\}\right] du = \\ &= T^2 \left[\frac{c_0}{T} + I(\underline{f})\right] \end{aligned}$$

Therefore for any δ

$$T^2 I(\underline{f})(1-\delta) \le A_T \le T^2 I(\underline{f})(1+\delta), \tag{2.17}$$

if T is large, and hence

$$L_+ \le -I(\underline{f}) + \limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0}\limsup_{n}\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T^2}\ln \mathbf{E}\big(e^{B_T(\zeta)};\ \ \zeta_T(\cdot)\in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})\big). \tag{2.18}$$

Next we show that the second term in (2.18) is equal to 0. We shall prove that

$$\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{C_T}{T^2} = O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right), \tag{2.19}$$

where

$$C_T := \ln \mathbf{E}\big(e^{B_T(\zeta)};\ \zeta_T(\cdot)\in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})\big).$$

There exist $\widetilde{C} > 0$ and $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$B_T := B_T(\underline{x}) = \sum_{i=0}^{N(T)} \ln(h(\underline{x}(t_i))) \le N(T)[\ln T + \ln \widetilde{C} + \ln \overline{f}] = N(T)\ln(C_1 T), \tag{2.20}$$

where $\overline{f} = \sup_{t\in[0,1], i=1,2}\{f_1(t), f_2(t)\}$.

The next step of the proof of (2.19) is based on the following

Lemma 2.2. *Let $N\left(\frac{1}{n}T\right)$ be a number of jumps of the process ζ on the interval $\left[0,\frac{1}{n}T\right]$. The number of the jumps on $\left[\frac{1}{n}T, T\right]$ is*

$$N^*\left(\frac{n-1}{n}T\right) = N(T) - N\left(\frac{1}{n}T\right). \tag{2.21}$$

For any $f\in F$ then there exist positive constants R_0 and R_1 such that for large n and small ε the inequality

$$e^{C_T} \le \mathbf{E}\exp\left\{N\left(\frac{1}{n}T\right)(\ln T + R_0) + \frac{1}{2}N^*\left(\frac{n-1}{n}T\right)(\ln T + R_1)\right\}, \tag{2.22}$$

holds.

Proof. Since $\min\{f_1(1), f_2(1)\} > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$\min_{\frac{1}{n}\le t\le 1}\min\{f_1(t)-\varepsilon,\ f_2(t)-\varepsilon\} = \nu > 0. \tag{2.23}$$

Moreover, ε and n can be chosen such that the inequality

$$\min\left\{f_1(1)-\varepsilon-\left(f_1\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)+\varepsilon\right),\ f_2(1)-\varepsilon-\left(f_2\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)+\varepsilon\right)\right\} = b > 0 \tag{2.24}$$

holds, as well. Let $\underline{g}\in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})$ be a path of ζ_T and $K_+ = K_+(\underline{g})$ be the number of jumps of $\underline{g}(\cdot) = (g_1(\cdot), g_2(\cdot))$ such that the values of g_1 or g_2 are increasing on the interval $\left[\frac{1}{n},1\right]$. Recall that the path $\underline{g}$ can increase by the increments either $(1,0)$ or $(0,1)$. The difference $g_i(1)-g_i\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)>0,\ \ i=1,2$, since $\underline{g}\in U_{n,\varepsilon}(f)$. Thus

$$K_+ - K_- \geq 0$$

where $K_- = N^*\left(\frac{n-1}{n}T\right)-K_+$, and hence

$$K_+ \geq \frac{1}{2}N^*\left(\frac{n-1}{n}T\right). \tag{2.25}$$

Next we introduce a compound Poisson process $\eta(t)=(\eta_1(t),\eta_2(t)),\ t\in[0,\infty)$ having the same jump values and their moments as $\zeta(t)$. It means that the jump values of η are from the set

$$\mathcal{Y} := \{(1,0),(0,1),(-1,0),(0,-1),(-1,-1)\}.$$

The distinction between η of ζ is that the probabilities of the jumps of η are equal for all values from $\mathcal{Y}$, that is the probability of any jump is equal to $\frac{1}{5}$. Thereby the process η is homogenous both in time and in space. The scaled process sequence $\left(\eta_T(\cdot)=\frac{1}{T}\eta(\cdot T)\right)$ is defined on $[0,1]$, and relations of η_T and ζ_T are similar to those of η and ζ.

The process η as well as any η_T may take negative values. Therefore a density of ζ_T with the respect to η_T is 0 on the paths $\underline{f}(\cdot)$ taking negative value, however the density is positive and equal to

$$\mathcal{Q}_T(\underline{f}) = K_T 5^{N(T)}\prod_{i=1}^{N(T)} p_{\underline{f}(t_i)}(\underline{f}(t_i+0)-\underline{f}(t_i)), \tag{2.26}$$

if $\min\limits_{t\in[0,1]}\{f_1(t),f_2(t)\}\geq 0$, where $t_i\in[0,1]$ are moments of the jumps (see (2.14)) and $K_T = \mathbf{P}(\min_u \eta_T(u)<0)$. It is clear that

$$\max_i \frac{p_{\underline{f}(t_i)}(\underline{f}(t_i+0)-\underline{f}(t_i))}{\frac{1}{5}} \leq 5. \tag{2.27}$$

However for positive jumps, that is for the jumps when $\max\limits_{j=1,2}\{f_j(t_i+0)-f_j(t_i)\}>0$ upper bound is much less (see (2.23))

$$5p_{\underline{f}(t_i)}(\underline{f}(t_i+0)-\underline{f}(t_i)) \leq \frac{C}{\nu T}, \tag{2.28}$$

where $C>0$. Therefore for a large T

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Q}(\underline{f}) &\leq K_T 5^{N(T)-K_+}\left(\frac{C}{T\nu}\right)^{K_+}\\ &\leq K_T\exp\left\{N(T)\ln 5-\frac{1}{2}N^*\Big(T\frac{n-1}{n}\Big)\ln\Big(\frac{T\nu}{C}\Big)\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Using the above inequality we obtain the following sequence of estimates

$$\begin{aligned} e^{C_T} &:= \mathbf{E}(e^{B_T};\ \zeta(\cdot) \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})) \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}(e^{N(T)\ln(TC_1)};\ \zeta(\cdot) \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})) \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}(e^{N(T)\ln(TC_1)}\mathcal{Q}(\eta);\ \eta(\cdot) \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})) \\ &\leq K_T \mathbf{E} e^{N(T)\ln(TC_1)+N(T)\ln 5-\frac{1}{2}N^*(T\frac{n-1}{n})\ln(T\nu/C)} \\ &= K_T \mathbf{E} e^{N(T\frac{1}{n})[\ln T+R_0]+\frac{1}{2}N^*(T\frac{n-1}{n})[\ln T+R_1]}, \end{aligned}$$

where the constants R_0 and R_1 are chosen as the following

$$R_0 = \ln(5C_1), \quad R_1 = 2\ln\left(\frac{5C_1C}{\nu}\right).$$

$\square$

Finishing the proof of the upper bound (2.18) remark that the random variable $N(S)$ has Poisson distribution with a parameter S. Hence

$$\mathbf{E}e^{\theta N(S)} = e^{S(e^\theta - 1)}.$$

Using (2.22) we obtain

$$e^{C_T} \leq K_T e^{T\frac{1}{n}(e^{\ln T+R_0}-1)} e^{T\frac{n-1}{n}(e^{\frac{1}{2}(\ln T+R_1)}-1)} \leq K_T e^{\frac{1}{n}T^2 e^{R_0}+\frac{n-1}{n}T^{3/2}e^{\frac{R_1}{2}}}.$$

which implies

$$\limsup_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T^2} C_T \leq \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T^2}\left(\frac{1}{n}T^2 e^{R_0} + \frac{n-1}{n}T^{3/2}e^{\frac{R_1}{2}}\right) = \frac{1}{n}e^{R_0}.$$

This inequality proves (2.19) and it finishes the proof of the upper bound (2.13).

(ii) Lower Bound. We have to prove the inequality

$$L_- := \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\liminf_{n}\liminf_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T^2}\ln\mathbf{P}\big(\xi_T \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})\big) \geq -I(\underline{f}). \tag{2.29}$$

The probability of the event $(\xi_T \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f}))$ can be lower estimated by the probability of a more restricted event $(\xi_T \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f}),\ N(T) \leq CT)$. Because the number $N(T)$ of the jumps of ξ on $[0,T]$ at given $\underline{f}$ is proportional to T, then the order of probabilities values of both events is the same when $T \to \infty$ if the constant $C > 0$ is large enough. A value of the constant C depends on $\underline{f}$. Using the representation ξ in terms of the process ζ (see (2.16)) and the estimate (2.17) we obtain the lower estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &\liminf_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T^2}\ln\mathbf{P}\big(\xi_T \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})\big) \qquad (2.30) \\ &\geq -I(\underline{f})(1+\delta) + \liminf_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T^2}\ln\mathbf{P}\big(\zeta_T \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f}),\ N(T) \leq CT\big). \end{aligned}$$

Our next goal is to find an lower estimate of

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\zeta_T \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f}),\ N(T) \le CT\big).$$

We apply the same method that we used in the previous step representing the process ζ_T by η_T with the density (2.26). Given $\underline{f} \in F$ we can find a constant $K > 0$ such that the density $\mathcal{Q}$ has the following lower bound. For the pathes of η_T belonging to $U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})$ the inequality

$$\mathcal{Q}(\eta_T) \ge \left(\frac{1}{KT\overline{f}}\right)^{N(T)+1} \ge \left(\frac{1}{KT\overline{f}}\right)^{CT+1},$$

holds, where $\overline{f} = \sup_{t\in[0,1],i=1,2}\{f_1(t), f_2(t)\}$. The process η_T can take negative values. Then the density (2.26) is 0. However for any n we can found ε such that all functions $g \in U_{n,\varepsilon}$ are positive. Then

$$\mathbf{P}\big(\zeta_T \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f}),\ N(T) \le CT\big) \ge \left(\frac{1}{KT\overline{f}}\right)^{CT+1} \mathbf{P}\big(\eta_T \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f}),\ N(T) \le CT\big).$$

The process η_T is homogeneous in space and time, therefore it satisfies the large deviation principle and

$$\liminf_{T} \frac{1}{T} \ln \mathbf{P}\big(\eta_T \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f}),\ N(T) \le CT\big) \ge -\inf_{g\in U_{n,\varepsilon}} J(\underline{f}) > -\infty,$$

where $J(\underline{f})$ is the rate function of η_T (see [10]). Thereby

$$\liminf_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T^2} \ln \mathbf{P}\big(\zeta_T \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f}),\ N(T) \le CT\big) = 0.$$

□

Conditioned e-lldp

Let $\widehat{P}$ be a conditional measure on F defined as

$$\widehat{P}(G) = \frac{P(G)}{P(F)}$$

where $G \subset F$. The following corollary is conditional e-lldp on F.

Corollary 2.3. *For any* $\underline{f} \in F_c$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n}\lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T^2} \ln \widehat{P}_T\big(U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})\big) = -I(\underline{f}). \tag{2.31}$$

Proof. We have to prove the upper bound (2.13) and the lower bound (2.29) with replacing $\mathbf{P}\big(\xi_T \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})\big)$ by $\widehat{P}_T\big(U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})\big)$. Let $\underline{g}_\delta \in F$ be such that $I(\underline{g}_\delta) \le \delta$, where $\delta > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{L}_+ &:= \limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0}\limsup_{n}\limsup_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T^2} \ln \widehat{P}_T\big(U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})\big) \\
&\le \limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0}\limsup_{n}\limsup_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T^2} \Big[\ln P_T\big(U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})\big) - \ln P_T\big(U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{g}_\delta)\big)\Big] \\
&= -I(\underline{f}) + I(\underline{g}_\delta) \quad \le \quad -I(\underline{f}) + \delta.
\end{aligned}$$

The upper bound is obtained when $\delta \to 0$.

The lower bound is obtained by

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{L}_- &:= \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\liminf_{n}\liminf_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T^2}\ln \widehat{P}_T\big(U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})\big) \\ &\geq \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\liminf_{n}\liminf_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T^2}\ln P_T\big(U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})\big) \quad = \quad -I(\underline{f})\end{aligned}$$

□

Another scalings for the definition of the processes ξ_T are possible. For example, the processes $\xi_T^\alpha(u) = \frac{1}{T^\alpha}\xi(uT),\ u \in [0,1]$ with some $\alpha \in (0,1)$ are satisfied to

Theorem 2.4. *For any* $\underline{f} \in F_c$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n}\lim_{T\to\infty}\ln \mathbf{P}\big(\xi_T^\alpha \in U_{n,\varepsilon}(\underline{f})\big) = -I(\underline{f}). \tag{2.32}$$

2.3 The large deviation principle

The large deviation principle for the escaping measure is proved here in a restricted form. Let $\underline{f}_{(n,\gamma)} = (f_{1,(n,\gamma)}, f_{2,(n,\gamma)})$ be a trajectory on $[0,1]$, where

$$f_{i,(n,\gamma)} = \begin{cases}\gamma n t, & \text{if } t < \frac{1}{n},\\ \gamma, & \text{if } t \geq \frac{1}{n},\end{cases} \quad i = 1,2.$$

Union of sets

$$F_{n,\gamma} = \{\underline{f} :\ f_i(t) \geq f_{i,(n,\gamma)},\ i = 1,2\}$$

over n and γ covers F:

$$F = \bigcup_{n,\gamma} F_{n,\gamma}$$

Theorem 2.5. *Let G be a set contained in $F_{n,\gamma}$ for some $n \geq 1$ and $\gamma > 0$ and let there exists $M > 0$ such that* $\sup\limits_{\underline{f}\in G}\sup\limits_{\substack{i=1,2,\\ t\in[0,1]}} f_i(t) \leq M$ *then*

$$-\inf_{\underline{f}\in \overset{\circ}{G}} I(\underline{f}) \leq \liminf_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T^2}\ln \mathbf{P}(\xi_T(\cdot) \in G) \leq \limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T^2}\ln \mathbf{P}(\xi_T(\cdot) \in G) \leq \inf_{\underline{f}\in\overline{G}} -I(\underline{f}),$$

where $\overset{\circ}{G}$ is interior of G and $\overline{G}$ is closure of G.

Proof. It follows of (2.16) that

$$\frac{1}{T^2}\ln \mathbf{P}(\xi_T(\cdot) \in \overline{G}) \leq -\inf_{\underline{f}\in\overline{G}} I(\underline{f})(1+\delta) + \limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T^2}\ln \mathbf{E}\big(e^{B_T}; \zeta_T(\cdot) \in \overline{G}(\underline{f})\big)$$

for any $\delta > 0$. The proof of relation

$$\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T^2}\ln \mathbf{E}\big(e^{B_T}; \zeta_T(\cdot) \in \overline{G}(\underline{f})\big) = O\Big(\frac{1}{n}\Big)$$

(see (2.19)), basically repeats the arguments of section 2.2 using M instead $\overline{f}$. It proves the upper bound.

The lower bound is obvious. $\square$

3 Acknowledgments

The authors thank N. Vvedenskaya for a number useful discussions, and A.A. Borovkov for stimulating questions.

The work of A.M. was partly supported by grants of President of RF (NSh-3695.2008.1) and of RFFI (08-01-00962). The work of E.P. was partly supported by grant of RFFI (11-01-00485). A.Y. thanks The National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq), Brazil, grant 308510/2010-0.

E.P. thanks USP, NUMEC for warm hospitality.

References

[1] S. R. S. Varadhan, Large Deviations and Applications, SIAM, Philadel- Philadelphia, 1984.

[2] A. Dembo, O. Zeitouni, Large Deviations Techniques and Applications, Second Edition, Springer, New York, 1998

[3] J. D. Deuschel and D. W. Stroock, Large Deviations, Academic Press, Boston, 1989.

[4] F. den Hollander, Large Deviations, Fields Institute Monographs 14, Provi- dence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 2000

[5] E. Olivieri, M. E. Vares, Large deviations and metastability, Cambridge University Press 2004

[6] S. R. S. Varadhan. Asymptotic probabilities and differential equations. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 19:261-286, 1966.

[7] N. Vvedenskaya, Y. Suhov, V. Belitsky A non-linear model of trading mechanism on a financial market, arXiv:1201.4580, 2012

[8] A. Borovkov, A. Mogulskii, About large deviations principles in metrik spaces. Siber. Math. J. 51, 6, 989-1003 2010.

[9] Billingsley, Convergence of Probability Measures, (second edition) 1999, JOHN WILEY & SONS, INC. New York, Chichester, Weinheim, Brisbane, Singapore, Toronto

[10] J. Lynch, J. Sethuraman, Large deviations for processes with indepdent increments, Ann. Prob. 15, 2, 610-627, 1987